

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following observations.

1. Interview Summary

At the interview, proposed changes to claim 1 were discussed in order to more particularly describe the printed coating as extending over a predominant part of the total surface area of the substrate. It was agreed that U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) used to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) does not disclose a printed coating which extends over a predominant part of the total surface area of a substrate. It was also agreed that U.S. patent 4,455,039 (*Weitzen*), cited in the restriction requirement in the Office Action of January 13, 2009, does not disclose all of the aforementioned features added to claim 1.

2. In the Specification

The specification is amended to include appropriate section headings and to remove specific reference to the claims.

Entry of the amendment to the claims is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

3. In the Claims

Claim 1 is amended to emphasize and to more clearly recite that the second feature substance extends over a predominant part of the total surface area of a surface of the value document of the substrate.

Support for this amendatory language is found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0026] and [0030], and in Fig. 1.

Claim 13 is cancelled.

Claim 18 is cancelled in view of the amendment to claim 1.

The withdrawn claims 20-31 and 37 are hereby cancelled in order to expedite prosecution of this application.

The preamble of claim 32 is amended to recite a value document.

Claim 36 is cancelled.

Entry of the amendment to the claims is respectfully requested in the next Office communication

4. Objection to the Claims

Claims 13, 20-31, 36 and 37 are hereby cancelled which render the objection to these claims moot.

Claim 32 is corrected to properly recite a value document as opposed to a method.

It is submitted that the claims are corrected in view of the amendment to the claims. Removal of the objection to the claims is kindly requested.

5. Rejection of claims 1-19, 32, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is kindly requested in view of the amendment to the claims and the discussion at the interview.

In short, U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) does not disclose a second feature substance which extends over a predominant part of the total surface area of the value document substrate (see Fig. 1 by way of 22 and 23).

As result, *Bratchley* does not anticipate every limitation of the claims involved in this rejection.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in view of EP 0 052 624 (*Kaule*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is kindly requested in view of the fact that *Kaule* does not make up for the shortcomings of *Bratchley*, as discussed above in reference to claim 1. Claim 7 depends from claim 1, and is thus patentable at least on the basis of its dependency from claim 1.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

7. Rejection of claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in view of *Anti-Stokes Phosphors/Luminophors (ASPL)*

Reconsideration of this rejection is kindly requested in view of the fact that *ASPL* does not make up for the shortcomings of *Bratchley*, as discussed above in reference to claim 1. Claims 33 and 34 depend from claim 1, and is thus patentable at least on the basis of its dependency from claim 1.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

8. Conclusion

As a result of the election and amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: July 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Justin J. Cassell/

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205